REMARKS

Claims 1-3 are Allowable

The Office has rejected Claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), at Page 2, paragraph 2 of the Office Action, as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,845,557 ("Lang"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

None of the cited references, including Lang, disclose or suggest the specific combination of Claim 1. In contrast to Claim 1, Lang discloses a field motion suppression technique in interlaced video displays, which preserves vertical resolution of a resulting motion suppressed video frame. (Lang, col. 1, ll. 7-10). Lang discloses determining a value of a particular pixel by taking the difference between the particular pixel and known pixels above and below it in the same field. (Lang, col. 2, ll. 27-43). Further, Lang discloses inputting such differences to a multiplexer that yields a series of values to make up a modified field. (Lang, col. 3, ll. 43-52). Lang does not disclose or suggest a method of interleaving video data that includes determining an orientation of at least one edge of an image that includes a current pixel on which a sub-block of pixels is centered, as recited in Claim 1. Determining the orientation of one or more edges of the image can enhance the accuracy of estimating a replacement pixel value. Thus, Claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-3 depend from Claim 1, which Applicant has shown to be allowable. Thus, Lang does not disclose or suggest at least one element of each of the claims 2-3.

In addition, the dependent claims recite additional elements not disclosed or suggested in Lang. For example, Lang discloses determining a value for a particular pixel by taking the difference between the particular pixel and known pixels above and below it in the same field. (Lang, col. 2, ll. 27-43). Lang does not disclose determining a *replacement* for an interpolated pixel value by spatially filtering the sub-block of pixels. Additionally, Lang does not disclose selecting at least one spatial filter of a set of spatial filters based on the orientation of the one or more edges of the image, as recited in Claim 2. For this additional reason, Claim 2 is allowable.

Claims 4-5 are Allowable

The Office has objected to claims 4-5, at Page 2, paragraph 1 of the Office Action, stating that in line 2 of Claim 4, *"products"* should be singular. Applicant has made the appropriate correction and asks that the objection be withdrawn.

Additionally, the Office has rejected Claims 4-5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), at Page 3, paragraph 1 of the Office Action, as being unpatentable over Lang. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

As explained previously, Lang does not include each and every element of claims 1 or 2. Claim 4 depends from Claim 2, and Claim 5 depends from Claim 4. Thus, Lang does not disclose at least one element of claims 4-5, at least by virtue of Claim 4 depending from Claim 2.

In addition, the dependent claims recite additional elements not disclosed or suggested in Lang. As explained previously, Lang does not disclose determining a *replacement* for an interpolated pixel value by spatially filtering a sub-block of pixels centered on a pixel for which the interpolated pixel value is determined. Additionally, Lang does not disclose determining an optimum filter value from a set of filter values that are determined by applying one or more selected spatial filters to the sub-block. Further, Lang does not disclose calculating a set of video values from the sub-block of pixel values in a fashion determined by such an optimum filter value. For this additional reason, Claim 5 is allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the application and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims. If, for any reason, the Office is unable to allow the Application on the next Office Action, and believes a telephone interview would be helpful, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-2469.

Respectfully submitted,

_____8-1-06_____
Date

Chad M. Herring

Chad M. Herring, 41,067
Attorney for Applicant(s)
TOLER SCHAFFER, L.L.P.
5000 Plaza On The Lake, Suite 265
Austin, Texas 78746
(512) 327-5515 (phone)
(512) 327-5575 (fax)